

MASTER ISSUES LIST - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Revision Date	Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Revision Date
Billing	1	Resolved*	02/02/00	Metering	40	Resolved*	05/18/00
Billing	2	Resolved*	02/02/00	Meter-VEE	41	03/21/01
Billing	3	Resolved*	02/02/00	Remittance	42	08/22/01
Billing	4	Resolved*	02/02/00	Billing	43	Resolved*	02/07/01
Billing	5	Resolved*	02/02/00	Policy	44	Resolved*	05/23/00
Billing	6	Resolved*	02/02/00	Metering	45	Resolved*	05/18/00
Billing	7	Resolved*	06/22/00	Policy	46	Resolved*	04/25/00
Billing	8	Resolved*	02/24/00	Policy	47	01/25/00
Billing	9	Resolved*	02/24/00	Policy	48	Resolved*	02/29/00
Billing	10	Resolved*	03/08/00	DASR	49	01/25/00
Billing	11	Resolved*	02/02/00	DASR	50	01/25/00
Billing	12	Resolved*	02/02/00	DASR	51	01/25/00
Billing	13	Resolved*	02/02/00	Policy	52	06/20/01
Billing	14	Resolved*	02/02/00	Metering	53	Resolved*	10/11/00
Billing	15	Resolved*	02/02/00	Metering	54	Resolved*	10/11/00
Billing	16	Resolved*	04/06/00	Policy	55	Resolved.....	04/18/01
Billing	17	Resolved*	02/24/00	Policy	56	Resolved*	02/07/01
Billing	18	02/21/01	Billing	57	Resolved*	02/21/01
Billing	19	Resolved*	10/19/00	Billing	58	Resolved*	10/12/00
Billing	20	Resolved*	02/02/00	Policy	59	Resolved*	11/01/00
Billing	21	Resolved*	02/21/01	Billing	60	05/02/01
Billing	22	Resolved*	03/08/00	Metering	61	08/22/01
Billing	23	Resolved*	04/06/00	Billing	62	Resolved*	10/26/00
Billing	24	Resolved*	10/12/00	Billing	63	Resolved*	02/07/01
Meter-VEE	25	02/21/01	Metering	64	Resolved*	04/13/00
Policy	26	Resolved*	02/21/01	Metering	65	Resolved*	07/20/00
Policy	27	Resolved*	02/29/00	Metering	66	Resolved*	04/27/00
Policy	28	Resolved*	02/07/01	Metering	67	Resolved*	10/11/00
Policy	29	Resolved*	02/07/01	Metering	68	Resolved*	02/17/00
Remittance	30	01/27/00	Policy	69	Resolved*	02/21/01
Remittance	31	02/21/01	Policy	70	Resolved*	02/21/01
Policy	32	Resolved*	02/07/01	Metering	71	Resolved	06/20/01
Metering	33	Resolved*	06/22/00	Billing	72	Resolved*	10/12/00
Policy	34	Pending	01/27/00	Policy	73	Resolved*	02/07/01
Metering	35	Resolved*	02/21/01	Policy	74	Resolved*	04/25/00
Policy	36	Resolved*	02/07/01	DASR	75	Resolved*	05/02/01
Metering	37	Resolved*	04/27/00	DASR	76	Resolved*	05/02/01
Policy	38	Resolved*	08/22/01	Policy	77	Resolved*	06/22/00
Metering	39	Resolved*	10/11/00	Policy	78	Pending	07/20/00

Subcommit- tee	Issue #	Status	Revision Date
Metering	79	Resolved*	02/07/01
Policy	80	06/22/00
Policy	81	Resolved*	04/18/01
Billing	82	Resolved*	10/12/00
Metering	83	Resolved*	04/18/01
Policy	84	08/22/01
Policy	85	08/22/01
Policy	86	Resolved*	02/07/01
Policy	87	Resolved*	08/01/01
Metering	88	Resolved*	12/04/00
Policy	89	Resolved*	02/21/01
Metering	90	Resolved*	02/21/01
Metering	91	Resolved*	11/15/00
Policy	92	Resolved*	08/01/01
Policy	93	Resolved*	02/07/01
Metering	94	04/18/01
Metering	95	Resolved*	08/01/01
Billing	96	Resolved*	11/16/00
Policy	97	Resolved*	08/22/01
Policy	98	Resolved*	02/21/01
Policy	99	02/21/01
Policy	100	Resolved*	04/18/01
Task Team	101	08/22/01
Policy	102		07/20/00
Policy	103		03/21/01
Policy	104		02/07/01
Policy	105		02/07/01
Policy	106		02/07/01
Task Team	107		09/12/01
Policy	108	Resolved*	03/07/01
Policy	109		03/21/01

Subcommit- tee	Issue #	Status	Revision Date
Policy	110		03/07/01
Policy	111	Resolved*	06/06/01
Policy	112	Resolved*	09/12/01
Policy	113		09/12/01
Policy	114	Resolved*	09/12/01
Policy	115	Resolved*	09/12/01
Policy	116		05/02/01
Policy	117		05/02/01
Policy	118		06/06/01
Policy	119		06/06/01
Policy	120		07/11/01
Policy	121		07/11/01
Policy	122		07/11/01
Policy	123		07/11/01
Task Team	124		09/12/01
Task Team	125		07/11/01
Task Team	126	Resolved*	09/12/01
Policy	127		09/12/01
Policy	128		07/11/01
Policy	129		08/01/01
Policy	130		08/22/01
Policy	131		09/12/01
Policy	132	Resolved*	09/12/01

*See separate Resolved Issues document

Highlighted entries will be moved to the resolved issues list January 1, 2002

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
18	<p>For end use customer billing (dual billing situation), ACC Rules are not specific about what the utility and ESPs are obligated to show on their bills.</p> <p>ESP</p>	02/02/00	Billing			<p>02/02/00 In many markets (CA specifically) begin and end meter reads need not be displayed on a bill. In Arizona market, utilities are required to show specific pieces of information but it's unclear if ESPs are required to follow same rules.</p> <p>This could apply to all revenue cycle services.</p> <p>02/24/00 (ACC - Bill Rigsby) reported on ACC Rules, refer to sections R14-2-210B-2 and R14-2-1612. Verbiage states that ALL bills must contain the data elements referred to in these sections. UDCs would be required to show a generation line item on their bill (dual billing) showing a zero amount due. Additionally, ESP would be required to show a CTC charge on their portion of the bill with a zero amount due.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs/UDCs create a proposal for short term solution which may require filing for waiver to the Rules as a short term solution. All parties to come up with possible long-term changes to the Rules.</p> <p>Issue for MRSPs: Begin and end reads must be printed on bill according to the Rules. So, these must be passed to the billing parties.</p> <p>03/08/00 Should a Rule change be suggested as a short-term solution. It is possible to put this in a combined waiver of issues that need to be changed in the Rules. A long term solution would be actually to change the verbiage.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs and UDCs should come prepared with their company's position in regards to filing waivers. Group will come up with proposal about how this issue should be resolved.</p> <p>03/14/00 Decision to have a separate waiver filed for this issue (separate from #28,36, & 56).</p> <p>03/22/00 Proposal: Bill party needs to itemize the bill components to allow customer to break down/re-calculate the bill.</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>10/11/00 – October 4, 2000 Rule tweaking package approved – 1612 changed but not 210 B2. 210 B2 DOES need to be chngd. Shirley will let Barbara Keene know and wait for direction from Staff on how to handle the existing waiver.</p> <p>2/21/01 Barbara Keene had advised the group at a previous meeting that the PSWG might need to submit a new waiver with documentation to support the waiver.</p>		
25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads. (PSWG – Billing)	01/26/00	Meter-VEE		See issue 101	<p>01/26/00 Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.</p> <p>02/01/00 What is the utilities responsibility to audit MRSPs? Rules state this certification must take place yearly.</p> <p>04/27/00 A sub/subgroup was formed to review existing VEE rules, develop objectives, changes and proposals (if needed), develop performance measures and monitoring criteria. TEP - Tony Gilloly, APSES, New West Energy - Janie Mollon, C3 Comm, CSC, APS, SRP - Greg Carrel, a representative from the Co-ops (possibly Barry Scott), and possibly First Point. Renee Castillo volunteered to chair this sub/subgroup and will set up a meeting with these participants.</p> <p>06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering subcommittee</p> <p>10/11/00 – This has previously been assigned to VEE</p> <p>2/21/01 – This issue will be addressed in the MRSP performance monitoring task team with issue 101.</p>		Open
30	Do we need to prioritize transactions by importance due to financial considerations and customer service (for problem resolution and cycle time of EDI 824)?	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		<p>Example, SRP requires acknowledgement both incoming and outgoing within 24 hours.</p> <p>All subcommittees need to define transaction cycle time.</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
31	Is there a need to standardize dual path or single path when handling the 820? Do we provide a remittance advice directly to ESP and payment directly to bank (dual path)? OR do both documents go directly to bank (single path)?	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		<p>Payments go to bank and details go to provider. Since most banks are currently using VANS, sending both transactions may be costly to sending parties.</p> <p>2/21/01 –TEP & SRP use a dual path, APS uses a single path. This issue will be discussed more if the future.</p>		Open
38	Will UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes? (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		08/22/01	<p>(New West Energy - Janie) will clarify at 03/13/00 meeting.</p> <p>Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes.</p> <p>Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide information of all sites (even those not going DA) to customer. If there is no IDR meter at site, customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from UDC and pay associated costs.</p> <p>08/22/01 APS- Provided the proper equipment is in place, APS will allow the customer or their authorized third party access to the IDR Data. The customer would be responsible for paying for associated costs if proper equipment is not in place. TEP- Will not allow interrogation. CUC- Will not allow any ESP to directly interrogate Citizens meters, at this time. SRP- If there was a contractual agreement between SRP/ESP and the customer then interrogation would be allowed. COOPERATIVES: Will not allow meter interrogation, at this time. Electrical districts: Not at this time.</p> <p>Issue is resolved, refer to UDC practices.</p>	3	Resolved
41	Who is responsible for validating that a meter can be read after a MSP has set a new meter? "Day of Install"	01/27/00	Meter-VEE			<p>In CA, it's a requirement from CPUC (Rule 22), the ESP is responsible for ensuring newly installed meter can be read prior to 1st billing by MRSP or face penalties.</p> <p>02/03/00 (First Point) This is usually done at the meter in-</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	(Day of Removal, issue 103)					<p>stall time.</p> <p>04/27/00 To be addressed in the VEE sub/subgroup. 2/7/01 – the group clarified that this issue involves both the MSP and the MRSP</p> <p>3/21/01 The group agreed that a separate Task Team is required to develop the Day of Install and Day of Removal Process covering both MSP and MRSP responsibility. The Task Team will make a recommendation on where the process will reside (i.e. VEE doc, Metering Handbook etc). The group agreed to allow the MRSP or MSP Performance Task Team (whoever finishes first) to complete the Performance Monitoring document until they are ready to look at Day of Install/Day of Removal. At that time, the MRSP Performance Task Team will be put on hold while the Day of Install/Day of Removal task Team is established to complete the process. Once this process is complete, the MRSP Performance Task Team will re-group to develop the Performance monitoring criteria around Day of Install/Day of Removal. The MSP Performance Monitoring Task Team will also incorporate into their Performance Monitoring into their document.</p>		
42	Will we require an 824 on all transactions (accepted or take exception to a data element). Do we only want to get an 824 when there's a problem with data? (PSWG - Policy)	02/01/00	Remittance			<p>08/22/01</p> <p>APS: Not used for an 814. Does not recommend using for an 867 because no way to send back to ESP/MSP. APS recommends sending the 824 for invalid 810 and 820 data,</p> <p>TEP: Automatically sends verification (997) of the data currently. TEP does not recommend setting up an 824 response to the 867 or the 810</p> <p>CUC: Recommends usage of an 824 for invalid 867, but not acceptance of the 867. An 824 sample from the mid-Atlantic region is available from Citizens for interested parties.</p> <p>SRP: Currently sends the 824 for all 867s.</p> <p>COOPERATIVES: Recommends not implementing or using the 824.</p> <p>This is an issue that requires a task team and requires ESP participation, not an issue that can be resolved at this time.</p>		Open
47	Standardization of Billing Options (ESP and UDC	01/25/00	Policy			<p>A working group of market participants should study the intent of Commission Rules and make a determination that</p>	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	consolidated billing as well as Dual billing) from all UDCs should be implemented immediately to provide customer choice. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures. (APSES)					<p>applies to all UDCs. Terms and Conditions for credit, payments and partial payments, and other billing processes should be standardized for all UDCs. During the direct access rulemaking process, an earlier working group discussed whether billing options should be discretionary, but no consistent position was reached. Market participants need to clarify the procedures for consistency among UDCs.</p> <p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the limitations on customer choice caused by differences in billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion and criticism will be reduced, and ESPs will have flexibility to meet individual customer needs.</p>		
49	<p>Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. Business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in.</p> <p>Customer Moving: - Notification of direct access customer moving to new address within the same distribution company territory without having to return to bundled service. (APSES)</p>	01/25/00	DASR			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or UDC to implement a request, as provided by proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until out-bound/ in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. To develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.		Open
50	New Customer - Same Facility: - A new customer takes over an existing direct access facility, keeps same ESP and meter without returning to bun-	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	dled service. (APSES)							
51	Account Update – Notification of changed account information. UC and PD DASRs appear to be both in/out-bound in the Arizona DASR Handbook (APSES)	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open
52	UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for promptly communicating and resolving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and UDCs (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		see Issue 34	<p>Process should be initiated by any participant to establish communication to solve problem within a defined time frame, if possible, and, if necessary, to maintain communication until root cause analysis is complete. Standardized process should be implemented immediately by each participant and automated by all parties as soon as possible.</p> <p>An example of the California “MADEN” process is attached to the original change control document.</p> <p>Process will reduce meter and data errors that cause billing errors and delays in billing and receiving revenue. It will help provide customer satisfaction by reducing billing questions and complaints to both UDCs and ESPs.</p> <p>6/20/01 Citizens presented a sample MADEN for group discussion.</p>	3	Open
60	According to the Rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)	02/08/00	Billing			<p>*Refer to Issue 70</p> <p>05/02/01 This issue was earlier identified as a “quick hitter”, one that could easily be resolved, however at this meeting the group discussed the issue and determined that this is not a quick hitter. This is a process requiring a task team with scenarios covering different billing options, what happens when a customer switches ESPs one or more times. Other questions include: What happens if the third party to bill is no longer in business? What information is placed on the bill and whom do you send the bill to?</p>	2	Open
61	Who is responsible for tracking the performance of MSP and MRSP's?	02/08/00	Metering		see Issue 65	06/22/00 Discussion also focused on possible timelines and CUBR has performance standards. Reassigned from Policy to Metering.	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	What is the performance criteria What is process for communicating this information? (PSWG – Billing)					<p>0720/00 Issue should refer only to MSPs. (TEP) Position on MSP Performance Standards was provided.</p> <p>2/7/01 – the group confirmed that this issue deals with developing performance monitoring /testing criteria for MSPs</p> <p>2/07/01 – established a task team to develop – John Wallace – Chair due date 4-01</p> <p>3/7/01 The group reviewed and made recommendation to the status report. Additional task team meetings are required.</p> <p>3/21/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) reported that the next Task Team meeting is set for April 13th at New West Energy.</p> <p>04/04/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) reported that the next Task Team meeting is now scheduled for April 17th (the 13th is a holiday) at Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative building.</p> <p>04/18/01 John Wallace (GCSECA) reported on the status of the task team. The conclusion of the April 17 meeting was to disband until other processes are completed in order to have processes to monitor. Janie Mollon would like to see work continue to be a model for other states and to improve customer relationships, and reduce any negative impact to customers. Stacy Aguayo would like to see safety issues covered, as safety is a high priority. Jenine Schenk reported that the entire safety field hasn't been discussed in the metering task teams, or defined in the metering handbook. PSWG recommended the group disband at this point, however reserve time on 5/2/01 and discuss which issues are causing problems in measuring, or what items can be measured. Once issues are identified the group can determine when the MSP Performance Task Team can begin meeting again.</p> <p>05/02/01</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>The group brainstormed ideas/concepts on what criteria to monitor Meter Service Providers.</p> <p>TEP submitted a proposal for MSP performance monitoring.</p> <p>Stacy (APS): Does it make sense to create a PM packet based on current standards and then update and change the document and standards as they change in the future? Safety is a primary concern for APS and is a priority item to monitor. An example of safety criteria: How well did an MSP install that equipment/meter.</p> <p>TEP feels we need to get something down now, going over current documents. Timeliness of document submittal is a good item to track; safety hasn't been covered in PSWG so it TEP realizes it is more difficult to track.</p> <p>Jenine (APS) and June Greenrock (SRP) still find that it is hard to track the documents and what qualifies as a problem/event. The flow of documents for MSP is a more manual process (as compared to the MRSP process) so tracking is a concern/burden to the entities.</p> <p>The group came to a consensus that at a high-level performance monitoring can be done and the task team should meet again. The MSP task team has been assigned to review the ACC CC&N, Business rule Comparison / Proposed Arizona Best Practices, and the Metering Form Packet and come up with high level processes (areas) and which documents should be used to monitor MSPs. At this point, thresholds to establish decertification and warning letters should NOT be done</p> <p>An item to keep in mind for future meeting: Performance monitoring tracking for the monthly PMR may be based on a percentage of errors of errors on transactions with that MSP on a daily basis. (Example: 25 transactions on Monday with 5 errors is a 20% error for the day).</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <p>The task team will present a draft document at the July 11 meeting documenting at a fairly high level what will be monitored and how it will be monitored.</p> <p>05/16/01</p> <p>Minutes from 5/15/01 meeting were sent out 5/16. Documents were reviewed (CCN, Metering forms, ANSI stan-</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>dards) and items were selected to monitor</p> <p>06/06/01</p> <p>John Wallace (GCSECA) gave a status report. John's concern is that the task team creates rules for MSP's without MSP representation. He suggests that the group finish what was started but not delve too much further into performance monitoring until further MSP representation is present.</p> <p>Bob Gray (Staff): mentioned that MSPs are notified by e-mail of meetings and it is up to them to represent themselves. Work should not be held up due to lack of representation.</p> <p>Action Item: Commission Staff: How does AXON CCN get removed? How do they get removed from the ACC certificated supplier list on the web-site?</p> <p>06/20/01</p> <p>Substantial progress was made, a formal draft report will be ready for the next meeting, a reporting structure was created, daily event notification data fields were required were outlined. At this point, only monitoring Unexpected MIRNS on Initial Switch, Late MIRNS, MIRN data incomplete (missing data). Next meeting July 9th, at Grand Canyon State Cooperate facilities. 9:30 – 4 pm</p> <p>07/11/01</p> <p>A final document has been distributed with the minutes from the 7/09/01 meeting. Have comments to Jenine Schenk by July 18th with a meeting scheduled for the 19th. Comments will be incorporated at the 19th meeting. The document with comments will be sent out the 23rd. The intent is to vote on this document at the August 1st meeting.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: All participants: Review and comment on the MSP document.</p> <p>08/01/01</p> <p>This document needs similar verbiage as shown in the MRSP performance monitoring.</p> <p>Add to the end of the purpose: "The UDC may monitory MRSP performance, if the UDC decides to monitor MRSP performance in total or in part, the UDC may not exceed this standard."</p> <p>The vote for this document was included with the MRSP vote be-</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>cause the change is the same.</p> <p>A separate redlined version of the document will be distributed prior to the next meeting. The changes will individually be voted on followed by a vote on the entire document. Participants must send changes (a redlined copy) to Jenine Schenk by August 8th. Sjenine.schenk@aps.com</p> <p>08/22/01</p> <p>Final comments were reviewed and voted on for inclusion in the final document. Only one addition to the document was suggested.</p> <p>Citizens suggested addition to the introduction: "The UDC may monitor MSP performance, if the UDC decides to monitor MSP performance in total or in part, the UDC may not alter the non-compliance calculation method in this standard."</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the document with the addition to the introduction:</u> YES Votes: APS, CUC, Cooperatives NO Votes: TEP, SRP, Electrical Districts Amended version failed.</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the original document</u> YES: APS, SRP, TEP, Cooperatives, Electrical Districts NO: CUC The document passed without revisions.</p> <p>The document will be inserted into the metering handbook and will be forwarded the Utilities Director for approval once implementation timelines have been gathered.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM</p> <p>A timeline to implement this process is needed from each entity. Send implementation timeline to Tony Gillooly by August 29th. Jenine Schenk (APS) will insert the chapter into the Metering handbook and forward to Tony Gillooly (TEP) by August 29th</p>		
78	There is no language in Rules preventing MSP from contracting directly with customers, how should this issue be ad-	03/28/00	Policy	08/07/00		<p>System implications – Will MSP have to submit DASR's?</p> <p>Rule change suggestion: Change the definition in Section R14-2-1601 "DASR means a form that contains all necessary billing and metering information to allow customers to</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	dressed?					<p>switch electric service providers. This form must be submitted to the Utility Distribution Company <i>by the customer's Electric Service Provider</i> load serving entity."</p> <p>This may force UDCs to create contracts for MSPs. ESP would send DASR but they would not be liable for MSP. Contract would allow UDC to hold MSP liable.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All participants to assess impacts of MSP contracting directly with customer. Be prepared to discuss your company's position and provide solutions to this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) agrees there is no language in rules that precludes customer contracting directly with MSP. TEP would like to see language added to rules that would not allow a customer to contract directly with an MSP. (APS) identified contractual and system impacts if customer contracts directly with MSP. Systems and processes were developed to transmit DASR directly with ESP only. (APSES) leans towards customer not subcontracting directly with MSP. MSPs should work through ESP so customer doesn't end up with a metering system ESP or MRSP cannot read.</p> <p>06/22/00 To be reviewed by ACC staff. Is this within the purview of PSWG? <u>Action:</u> (due 06/30) Participants to submit position papers per 06/22/00 minutes.</p> <p>07/04/00 (Marv Buck) provided an overview of how other states are handling. Participants (NWE, APS, TEP, Phaser, SRP, APSES) presented their positions in a consolidated document to the PSWG.</p> <p>07/20/00 Steve Olea presented ACC staff position: Electric Competition rules allow MSPs to contract directly with customers; operating procedures need to be developed. Issue will include only MSPs at this time, but MRSPs will be kept on radar screen. <u>Action:</u> Participants may submit issue sheets, including 1) impact of issue on business processes and 2) any past practices in markets that provide insight to edryer@tucsonelectric.com by 08/07/00.</p>		
80	What are the security and	05/09/00	Policy			06/22/00 Priority set at 1.	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	encryption standards that will be used in transmitting data (Barry Scott).							
84	Is the bill that is issued when a customer switches considered a "final" bill?	07/19/00	Billing			<p>9/28/00 Staff confirmed that the when a customer switches providers or disconnect service, it is a "Final Bill".</p> <p>10/12/00 The group agreed that R14-2-210 A5b should be addressed/modified with the next Rule Tweaking Package - Waiver not needed at this time. Will raise at Policy Group Nov 1</p> <p>10/26/00 this issue covers all of section 5 not just 5b, will raise at Nov 1 Policy mtng</p> <p>2/21/01 – the group agreed that this is resolved because Staff confirmed at a prior meeting that the bill is considered a Final Bill when the customer switches providers. Staff confirmed that by New West Energy's definition of "Customer", that one service point closure would not be a Final Bill. Barbara Keene disagreed and will follow up with Staff and report at the March 7, 2001 meeting before status is updated.</p> <p>3/7/01 – Staff needs additional time – will report at the 3/21/01 meeting</p> <p>3/21/01 - Barbara Keene communicated that Staff is still working on the issue. Staff is looking for feedback from the Participants on how their positions in an effort to help direct Staff on this decision.</p> <p>The group confirmed that there are 2 issues that need to be addressed...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the definition of a Final Bill and Customer 2. Rules prohibiting estimation of Direct Access Bills and Final Bills – Need flexibility for situations where it is impossible to obtain reads (i.e. damaged meter etc.). <p>Barbara will report back at the 4-4-01 meeting. Deferred to 4/18.</p> <p>4/18/01 Report from Barbara The ESPs are correct in how they use the term "customer"</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>(see example), and the UDC's may use the same definition. The customer is defined as whom the bill is issued to. EX: If there are 50 Walgreens, and the UDC bills to one entity for all 50 stores, then there would not be a final bill if one Walgreens chose another generation provider. This does not eliminate the conflict when the bill is sent to each individual store, and that one store chooses another provider.</p> <p>Two waivers are needed to resolve the issue: 1. Waiver to have the ability estimate final bill, 2. Waiver to have the ability to estimate usage for a DA customer requiring load data. In the waiver, it must be indicated how the rules should be re-written.</p> <p>Action Item: A joint waiver was suggested to resolve these issues. Judy Taylor (TEP) will bring a draft waiver for "estimating the final bill". Judy will also look into creating the waiver for estimating usage of a DA customer, based on the "final bill" waiver for the May 2nd meeting.</p> <p>Action Item: Participants to contact their people to determine if each company is comfortable in supporting the joint waiver.</p> <p>05/02/01 Judy Taylor (TEP) presented draft waivers for the Final Bill and estimating usage for load profiled customers.</p> <p>John Wallace (GSECA) suggested re-arranging some of the text. This document appears to be more of a rule change request than a true waiver. A waiver is needed to get immediate relief from the inability to estimate. A second document proposing new language for the rules and citing examples why estimation may occur in the waiver may be a better route to pursue.</p> <p>Barbara Keene (Staff) indicated that a rule change could take years. She suggest that it may be better include rule changes in a separate document, but still attach to the Waiver. Is this waiver two separate documents, or one document (waiver) with an attachment (rule tweaking)? Barbara will check which documentation is preferred (one or two documents).</p> <p><u>ACTION ITEM:</u> Judy Taylor will revise the Waivers, separating the rule lan-</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>guage from the waivers seeking relief from the current rules. She will confirm with Barbara (Staff) that two separate documents are appropriate. New drafts will be passed out at the 5/16 meeting.</p> <p>6/20/01 Drafts were reviewed; company name changes were suggested, new drafts, ready for signatures may be presented at the 7/11 Meeting.</p> <p>07/11/01 Judy Taylor (TEP) presented draft waivers for the Final Bill and estimating usage for DA customers. Citizens suggested minor language changes that were accepted by the group.</p> <p>Waiver to estimate usage for First and Final Bill – all participants approved the waiver</p> <p>Waiver to estimate data for DA customers requiring load data – All participants approved the waiver.</p> <p>ACTION ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judy Taylor (TEP) will contact Ajo and Morenci to see if they wish to be included in the submittal of the waiver; will include them to the waivers, if necessary. All Participants must e-mail Judy with appropriate person in each company to send the signed waiver by Wednesday July 18, 2001. jtaylor@tucsonelectric.com <p>Judy Taylor (TEP) will send out the waivers with appropriate signature pages via certified mail July 20th. The original signed documents must be returned to Judy by August 20th as the document will be docketed the 21st.</p> <p>08/01/01 The proposed rule change language was reviewed and approved. The ACC staff has the proposed rule language and will consolidate these changes and others at the next rule making proceedings.</p> <p>NOTE: The waivers were sent out via e-mail because only two companies responded with physical mailing address.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Judy is looking for original signed pages by August 20, 2001.</p> <p>08/22/01 Update</p> <p><u>UPDATE ISSUE 84: Waiver to estimate for first and final bill and waiver to estimate for a DA customer requiring load data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Morenci was added to the waiver, but then was uncomfortable signing the waiver; TEP was unable to get their signature at the last minute. SRP and City of Mesa need to submit a letter to Director Utilities Division in support of the waiver. Navopache only sent a signature page for one waiver, -- the first and final bill waiver. 		
85	Grandfathering totalization of meters.	07/20/00	Policy			<p>Issue statement unclear</p> <p>08/22/01</p> <p>The issue is interpreted as the meters which were totalized prior to DA activity have the right to remain totalized when switching to DA as well as after the customer returns to SO.</p> <p>APS: Customers can go DA and return to SO totalized.</p> <p>TEP: Cannot discuss this issue, confidential negotiations.</p> <p>CUC: Recommends not grandfathering totalized meter accounts, The account should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>SRP: Customers can go DA and return to SO totalized.</p> <p>COOPERATIVES: Customers can go DA and return to SO totalized.</p> <p>Electrical Districts: Customers can go DA and return to SO totalized.</p> <p>The rules state you must bill each SDP separately unless the Utility has a totalized tariff or a special contract to totalize. The issue is not resolved. Will be re-visited if, and when TEP can discuss. May be resolved at a higher level.</p>		Open
87	Should a customer (w/out a UDC contract) be required to secure a new provider w/in 60 days after returning to Standard Of-	10/04/00	Policy		08/01/01	<p>APS' Schedule #1 section 3.5 has this requirement</p> <p>08/01/01</p> <p>Stacy Aguayo (APS), This is a section in APS's terms and conditions. If a DA customer is involuntarily returned to SO, the cus-</p>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	fer?					<p>tomers has 60 days to choose a new provider. If the customer does not choose an ESP, the customer must stay on the SO rate for one year.</p> <p>The issue was closed because it was an internal issue to APS and does not impact or require input from participants.</p>		
92	How do UDCs handle a customer requested disconnect for UDC or ESP? How do we differentiate between a DA customer and Bundled customer? What type of training?	9/13/00			08/01/01	<p>10/11/00 Issue raised by Janie Mollon (NEW) in the metering group – referred to Policy to assign to the appropriate group.</p> <p>–</p> <p>TEP, APS, SRP, AZ Cooperatives</p> <p>Refer the customer to the ESP for DASR submittal to the UDC. Once the DASR is received the UDC will initiate the orders to disconnect the service.</p> <p>08/01/01</p> <p>The training required to identify DA customers is an internal process, but all the participants indicated that the process is to route the customer's request to the ESP.</p> <p>Issue was closed</p>		Resolved
94	What is the timeframe for UDC to exchange the meters to return direct access customers to bundled service	10/25/00	Metering			<p>ESPs want a required timeframe for UDCs to complete the exchange and return to Bundled serv.</p> <p>10/11/00 New West Energy proposed a 10 working day from the DASR requirement.. UDCs to review and comment at next meeting</p> <p>10/25/00 The group discussed the issue and agreed to table it until Staff confirms if Standard Offer cust can own meters or not.</p> <p>11/29/00 – UDC processes have been documented in the Business Rule document. Will address this issue once the market is more established.</p> <p>4/18/01</p> <p>The time frame is: if the DASR is submitted 15 days prior to the read date, the meter change will occur on the read date. If not, the meter change will occur on the next read date. As stated by rule : R14-2-1612-J</p> <p>This issue is deferred until the market demands this item be addressed</p>	2	Open
95	What is the start read for a new meter sets	10/25/00	Metering		08/01/01	<p>10/25/00 Do meter set have to start at zero? Action item: participants will come back to November mtng with positions</p> <p>11/29-00 – SRP, TEP, APS require DA meters to be set at zero and CUC & SSVEC do not require reads at zero.</p> <p>Pending feedback form other Cooperatives</p>		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						08/01/01 SRP: must be set to zero SSVEC: the read can be zero or any number GCSECA: the read can be zero or any number TEP: the read can be zero or any number CUC: the read can be zero or any number APS: must be set to zero Issue was resolved now that the co-ops stated their position.		
97	D-Star is requiring 10 minute intervals for imbalance settlement,	11/1/00	Policy		08/22/01	11/1/00 FERC is requiring this by 12-15-01 – Unsure on when the PSWG should start addressing this. CA went to 10-min intervals on 8-1-00 and are doing in line interpolation. 08/22/01 Evelyn Dryer (TEP) indicated that <u>generators</u> need 10-minute intervals for imbalance, data does not need to be in 10 minute intervals the residential/retail market. D-Start entity may take 10-minute intervals and line-interpret to an hour for settlement and billing. There is an algorithm proposed in the D-star filing that addresses this issue. This issue can be closed because it does not affect the retail customer with the proposed algorithm.		Resolved
99	The use of Electronic Signatures for DA transactions (House Bill 2069)	11/15/00	Policy			11/15/00 The metering group requires a signature for the exch of the EPA form. Since metering is not the only group that this may apply to, it is passed to Policy and will be raised on 12-4-00. 2/21/01 – The group added that any request for data would also require a signature.		Open
101	MRSP performance monitoring and certification		Task Team			2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Janie Mollon due date 4/04/01 3/7/01 The group reviewed and made recommendation to the status report. Additional task team meetings are required. 3/21/01 Janie Mollon (New West Energy) reported that she has received comments back on the Performance document and will be addressing the comments from the March 7, 2001 Policy meeting as well. Janie will have drafts of the requested standard letters available for review by the group		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
101						<p>at the next Task Team meeting. -- The next meeting will be help at New West Energy on April 12th. An agenda will be sent out confirming the date and time</p> <p>04/04/01</p> <p>Janie Mollon (New West Energy) passed out a “Questions and Answers – Performance Monitoring Report” handout. This document is a compilation of comments from participants at meetings and e-mails to Janie. It will be used to clarify the issues that need to be covered in the next MRSP performance-monitoring meeting.</p> <p>A concern discussed at this meeting is that MRSP could be compliant regarding the PM, but still be de-certified for some other infractions not covered by the PM.</p> <p>Action Item: What are MRSP de-certification and ESP processes/rules for your company? And does this information belong in the PM document? Present at the MRSP meeting April 12, 2000</p> <p>04/18/01</p> <p>John Wallace reported on the status of the task team. Terms were defined, event, exception, violation, out of compliance. Problems were identified in how to count the various events/violations/exceptions for the PMR. This topic is to be discussed in the next meeting. Draft warning letters were standardized. Minutes and warning letters were sent out 4/18/01 by Mary Ippolito</p> <p>The warning letters going to ESP and MRSP are still a problem. There are some confidentiality issues in revealing the problems of an MRSP in other ESP territories to all other ESP's. Kathy Flood (SRP) requested a legal clarification from ACC legal department on this issue.</p> <p>Janie Mollon proposed monitoring solely by ESP (eliminate the aggregate monitoring), it will not be as complicated to monitor and eliminates the legal ramifications of sending warning letters to all ESP's</p> <p>John Wallace will be the new chair as Janie Mollon has been re-assigned at New West Energy.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
101						<p>An action item report from staff regarding to what happens to the letter sent to the director of the utilities division.</p> <p>The letter must state that it is an informal complaint. A person on the utilities director's office staff will handle the issue. If this does not resolve the issue, the formal complaint process must begin.</p> <p>Action Item: Barbara Keene will contact the Staff legal department for clarification on the right of the UDC to send warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories.</p> <p>5/16/01 Staff advised PSWG on the legalities of sending the warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories</p> <p>The UDC can give out violation information, unless there is a contract restricting the flow of that information. Violations are not considered confidential if the entity holds a CC&N.</p> <p>06/06/01 With the loss of AXON representation, PSWG requests another MRSP attend the meetings. Comments from staff regarding minutes from the MRSP meetings</p> <p>1) May 3rd : What is ACC continued Certification in the minutes and the draft? John Wallace stated that this is directly from the MRSP document posted on the ACC website.</p> <p>2) May 17th; GMT Waiver. Staff wonders what this waiver is. From Tony, this was not a waiver; it was misstated in the minutes.</p> <p>It is agreed that Interval data should be in GMT time, confusion is regarding if the header field for the EDI transaction is considered the "envelope", or if the time the entire EDI file is sent (e-mail) is the "envelope".</p> <p>06/20/01 Next meeting is scheduled for June 21, 2001, GCSEC Facilities.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
101						<p>7/11/01</p> <p>A final draft document will be sent out July 13th. Comments are due by the 20th. If there are significant comments, another meeting for the task team will be scheduled to review and address the issues. Barring any major concerns, the intent is to vote on this document at the August 1st meeting.</p> <p><u>Questions from the task team:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can we add the MRSP Performance monitoring to the Metering handbook to the Arizona State Direct Access Handbook? <p>Evelyn indicated that historically that the MSP and MRSP are two separate companies. It is better to keep the documents separated. Created a new issue to address the consistency issue between the MSP and MRSP documents. Resulted in a new issue# 124</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the responsibility of the MRSP task team pertaining to decertification. Resulted in a new issue #125 Should the VEE document be included with the metering handbook, or remain a stand-alone document? Resulted in a new issue #126 <p>ACTION ITEM:</p> <p>All participants: Review and comment on the MRSP document. Send comments to Kimarie Aycock (APS) by July 20th.</p> <p>08/01/01</p> <p>Additions to the document:</p> <p>Merilyn Ferrara (APSES) indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the document does not cover the day of install and needs to be explicitly stated this document doesn't address this topic the document does not cover a grace period (timeframe unknown) before performance monitoring starts and should be noted in the pending additions section. (under pending) the document needs to indicate that the UDC may use performance monitoring for de-certification, but Performance Monitoring may not be the only criteria for de-certification. 		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Paul Taylor (Beck/Citizens) requested the document be a guideline, not necessarily a requirement for the UDCs to perform. A point to consider is who's VEE is "right" in the instance where the UDC and MRSP perform VEE. To address this concern, SSVEC drafted this language to add to the end of the purpose statement: "The UDC may monitor MRSP performance, if the UDC decides to monitor MRSP performance in total or in part, the UDC may not exceed this standard."</p> <p>The group voted to whether to accept the document "as is", or add these comments into the document and delay the vote to the following meeting. Those entities voting in favor of accepting the document as presented were: SRP – Kathy Flood, SSVEC – Barry Scott, and TEP – Tony Gillooly. The following entities prefer to see an updated document that includes the comments from this meeting prior to voting to adopting the document:</p> <p>Citizens – Paul Taylor: APS – Kimarie Aycock, GCSECA-- John Wallace , APSES – Marilyn Ferrara</p> <p>A separate redlined version of the document will be distributed prior to the next meeting. The changes will individually be voted on followed by a vote on the entire document.</p> <p>Participants must send changes (a redlined copy) to Kimarie Aycock by August 8th. Kimarie.aycock@aps.com</p> <p>08/22/01</p> <p>Final comments were reviewed and voted on for inclusion in the final document.</p> <p><u>Vote to add suggested language to the Purpose:</u></p> <p>YES: APS, CUC, Cooperatives</p> <p>NO: TEP, SRP, Electrical Districts</p> <p>The sentence as suggested by Citizens will not be added to the document.</p> <p><u>Vote to add the suggested language to the Purpose & Pending addition sections by APSES:</u></p> <p>YES: APS, TEP, CUC, Cooperatives</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>NO: SRP, Electrical Districts Group approved the APSES additions.</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the entire document with amendments by APSES</u> YES: APS, TEP, Cooperatives NO: CUC, SRP, Electrical Districts Document was not approved with APSES amendments</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the document with no additions:</u> Yes: TEP SRP Cooperatives, Electrical Districts, APS No: CUC The document, with no revisions was approved.</p> <p>The document will be forwarded to the Utilities Director for approval once implementation timelines have been defined by each utility.</p> <p><u>ACTION ITEM</u> A timeline to implement this process is needed from each entity. Send implementation timeline to Tony Gillooly by August 29th.</p>		
102	Modify 867 to meet VEE rules		Policy			07/20/00 Missing intervals and zero intervals referred to next VEE session.		Open
103	Day of Removal (Day of install issue 41)		Policy			<p>3/21/01 Need to develop a procedure to ensure that when a meter is removed that all data is captured. Develop who is responsible for posting up to what time</p> <p>3/21/01 The group agreed that a separate Task Team is required to develop the Day of Install and Day of Removal Process covering both MSP and MRSP responsibility. The Task Team will make a recommendation on where the process will reside (i.e. VEE doc, Metering Handbook etc). The group agreed to allow the MRSP or MSP Performance Task Team (whoever finishes first) to complete the Performance Monitoring document until they are ready to look at Day of Install/Day of Removal. At that time, the MRSP Performance Task Team will be put on hold while the Day of Install/Day of Removal task Team is established to complete the process. Once this process is complete, the MRSP Performance Task Team will re-group to develop the Performance monitoring criteria around Day of Install/Day of Removal. The MSP Performance Monitoring Task Team</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						will also incorporate into their Performance Monitoring into their document.		
104	Develop VEE rules for Non IDR					02/07/01		Open
105	MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform.		Policy			02/07/01 Copied from issue 56 to separate the two issues.		Open
106	Develop a document showing all agreed upon billing business rules		Task Team		See issue 96	02/07/01		Open
107	Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules					<p>2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Stacy Aguayo due date 3/07/01</p> <p>2/21/01 – The group reviewed a proposed outline for the Metering Handbook</p> <p>3/7/01 The group agreed that the scope of this task has increased substantially. At this time, the Task Team will focus on filling in the sections that pertain only to issues the PSWG has approved and address the other sections later. With this specific focus, the Task Team is aiming to finalize their work by the April 4th meeting.</p> <p>3/21/01 Stacy Aguayo (APS) reported that the team is on task to have a draft of the AZ Metering Handbook ready for the April 4th meeting.</p> <p>04/04/01</p> <p>The Overview: Needs more information and detail regarding document purpose and how to read the document. Comments appreciated.</p> <p>Ch 1 and 2: This general information was never discussed in PSWG or other AZ meetings. This is a compilation from other utilities (out of state) as well as in-state processes.</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Comments appreciated.</p> <p>It was suggested moving the metering forms document approved by PSWG and currently posted on the ACC website into the metering handbook so ESP/MSP have a single place to look.</p> <p>Action Item: Participants need to review and redline the document. Send comments to Stacy Aguayo by April 18th. A draft incorporating all the comments will be presented by May 2nd, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>04/18/01 Stacy will create a master document of changes showing all substantive changes to text. Comments due no later than May 2nd. Each future meeting will have a two-hour discussion on these changes, beginning May 16th</p> <p>Sections of the Handbook from the Operating Procedures, that cannot have content changes because it is an approved document: (requires using the change control process): Section 2: MSP qualifications, 3.10 Primary metering and 3.4 ANSI standards</p> <p>Comments on the metering form packet from Staff: Two UDCs are missing: Aho Improvement Company, Morenci Water and Electric (Pgs 5 & 21 data elements). Can these UDCs be listed in this document despite not participating in the formation of the document?</p> <p>Report from Staff on Section 1.6 metering Handbook: This section is redundant from the rules, suggested removing the section details, but reference the State Rules (a general reference, not a specific listing of a rule).</p> <p>Action Item: Barbara will contact the two missing UDCs and advise them of the work of the PSWG and what standards have been developed. She will add them to distribution list so they can become active participants. Status report at May 2 mtg.</p> <p>05/16/01 Minor changes were included in the presented redlined version</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>(typo's, spelling, other little errors). Substantial changes were discussed and are noted on the "Participants Comments" chart. A new revision will be sent out prior to the June 6th meeting where the document will be further discussed.</p> <p><u>Overview</u> -- Minor Changes to wording</p> <p><u>Chapter one – Preface:</u> -- Instances of "standard offer" will be changed to "bundled Service"</p> <p><u>Chapter two – MSP Qualifications:</u> Tabled to the next meeting, Barbara Keene stated substantial changes may be made to this section despite being copied from approved documents.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM:</p> <p>All Participants: Look at the following chapters to clarify meaning: Chapter 2, Section 3.4 and 3.10 for the June 20th meeting.</p> <p>Chapter three – Equip requirements and meter products</p> <p>Section 3.9: define what load research meters are; re-word the remainder of the paragraph.</p> <p>Chapter four—Ownership -- Sections 4.3 and 4.3.1 to read 25 kV and below rather than zero up to 25kV</p> <p><u>Chapter 5, 6, 7 – No changes</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 8- Process flows</u> - Minor changes</p> <p>Chapter 9- Providing Meter information – minor changes</p> <p>Chapter 10- Purchasing/Transferring equipment-- Additions to "Purchasing of Existing Equipment" # 4 and #5.</p> <p>Reference documents:</p> <p>(1)TEP Comments, (2)Participants Comments on State of Arizona Direct Access Metering Handbook, (3) Citizens Comments, (4) Operating Procedures for Performing work on primary metered customers</p> <p>06/20/01</p> <p>Citizens presented additional over-all document comments.</p> <p>Chapter 2 and Chapter 3.10 (primary metering) will be reviewed in a separate meeting because there are too many problems and inconsistencies in these sections. Stacy Aguayo will be setting up this meeting.</p> <p>Send any further grammatical corrections to Stacy (APS) by next</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>week June 27 e-mail stacy.aguayo@aps.com The document was reviewed up to page 27 and will continue to be reviewed at the next meeting.</p> <p>07/11/01</p> <p>Evelyn Dryer (TEP) objected to the UDC re-writing chapter 2 because the classifications were written by actual MSPs in '96, '97. MSPs were the driving force behind the section, with no MSPs to review the document; substantial changes should not be made.</p> <p>Jenine Schenk (APS) indicated that no skills were removed, text was cleaned up/consolidated, and verified that each of the classes' knowledge increased as the class level increased. An APS sample was passed out.</p> <p>The remainder of the document was reviewed and corrected.</p> <p>The following questions were discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Can a UDC class 1 worker (or equivalent) be exposed to an energies panel up to 300 volts? 2) Do you allow UDC class one workers inside energized panels to connect communications? If no, do you allow class one to get inside panels to install meters? 3) How many classes of meter workers do you have? <p>These questions are a moot point because these sections relate to what work an MSP will allow their personnel to do, not what the UDC's allow their personnel to do.</p> <p>The group decided to re-vamp Chapter 2. Section 3.10 was reviewed. Both sections need further work.</p> <p>ACTION ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evelyn Dryer (TEP) will add to the introduction that chapter 2 was initially written by MSPs. ▪ Jenine Schenk (APS) will remove the content changes to chapter 2, but the format changes will remain. ▪ Rick Molina (TEP) will redline section 3.10 for the next meeting. <p>The documents related to these action items will be distributed by Friday July 19th with responses back to back to the submitting parties by Wednesday July 25th.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>08/01/01</p> <p>Chapter 2 and Section 3.10 of the metering handbook were reviewed and discussed.</p> <p>Chapter 2</p> <p>An overall comment/concern was raised by Paul Taylor (Beck/Citizens) that the UDC is required to follow the same rules, meaning that the UDC may have to set up the 3 worker classes as outlined in Ch 2. Removed last sentence in section 1.5, which indicated the UDC will follow the same rules set up in this document when operating as an MSP/MRSP. Removed for further review and re-wording.</p> <p>There is a concern that Certified may have a legal implication and maybe “certified” should be changed to “qualified” to avoid any problems with a MSP indicating their workers are certified No one knows who certifies the MSP workers, UDCs do not want the responsibility and the associated liability.</p> <p>The proposal of the group, as none of the UDCs are comfortable with the chapter, is to leave the chapter alone with the exception of two minor corrections. The corrections are: the inclusion of a sentence in the introduction indicating MSPs created chapter 2; and Class three workers should indicate a journeyman certificate is needed. A task team should be formed to correct the problems in the chapter in the future.</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Primary Metering</p> <p>Last two sentences in 3.10.1 will be moved to 3.10.2 and will be re-written so that “UDC” will be changed to “MSP” and the “shall” will be “shall not”. Add “isolation and grounding to the last sentence after “switching” and before “operations”. The numbering system will be adjusted for clarity.</p> <p>Letter “B” was re-worded</p> <p>No changes to A, C and F. Changes were made to D, E. G was removed.</p> <p>3.10.2 “The UDC, in coordination.. “ sentence was removed. Added, “unless mutually agreed upon. ... “ to last sentence.</p> <p>3.10.3 Sentences were removed in the middle of the paragraph</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>3.10.4 No changes 3.10.5 Removed the first sentence. New wording proposed for the last sentence from APS. Other minor wording changes. 3.10.6 Minor changes 3.10.7 Minor changes, remove example.</p> <p>All changes to date will be accepted and a final draft will be sent out. By August 8th. Comments should be sent to Stacy by August 15th. Stacy.aguayo@aps.com</p> <p>08/22/01 An updated version was provided at the meeting with some minor changes to spelling, grammar, and new line numbering <u>Page 8: Line 275</u>, Remove the reference to ACC website <u>Page 9: Line 322</u>: Remove “affected utility” add MSP to line. <u>Page 27: Line 1144</u>: Change text to remove “Excel” and clarify that document should be Excel format. Eliminates implication participants must use the Microsoft program. <u>Page 27: Line 1157</u>: Added verbiage to explain the file naming convention. <u>Page 21: Line 884 to 901</u>: 3.10.1.1 (and remove number 3.10.1) Move 2nd paragraph from 3.10.1.2, then remove remainder of 3.10.2 <u>Page 22 Line 905</u>: remove “primary” from section 3.10.2 <u>Page 9 line 354</u>: Add “when applicable” to end of sentence.</p> <p>New Issue 130: Need to create glossary of deregulation terms.</p> <p>Paul Taylor (RW BECK/Citizens) will send out a paper with Citizens concerns regarding this document for group review.</p> <p><u>Vote to adopt the document with changes above and correcting section 3.10 to reflect “pending further development”.</u></p> <p>Yes votes: APS, TEP, SRP, Cooperatives, Electrical Districts No votes: CUC</p> <p>The document will be forwarded to the Utilities Director for approval once implementation timelines have been defined by each utility.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A timeline to implement this document is needed from each entity. Send implementation timeline to Tony Gillooly (TEP) by August 29th. Tgilloly@tucsonelectric.com 2. Review section 3.10 sections A-F to make sure there are no gaps in what an MSP can and cannot do on primary metering. Stacy Aguayo (APS) will coordinate a meeting to discuss this section prior to the 9/12 PSWG meeting 		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>9/12/01</p> <p>Stacy Aguayo (APS) indicated that the document with revisions from last meeting have been completed, but were not submitted to Tony Gillooly (TEP). The group did not discuss section 3.10. It will be discussed at the September 19th, 2001 metering meeting at APS</p> <p>The group reviewed APS's comments to Citizens document posing questions and concerns about the handbook.</p> <p><u>Item 1:</u> New sections added to the document will require the PSWG to review the handbook and update/correct those sections (through the change control process) that may be affected by the newly created section. The group consensus is that it is okay to submit the document that is incomplete to establish to ESPs what is a standard at this time.</p> <p><u>Item #2</u> Group consensus indicated this item needs to be addressed.</p> <p><u>Item #3</u> Group consensus indicated this item needs to be addressed</p> <p>Action Item: All Utilities: What would legal departments suggest rather than use the word "certified" in this section</p> <p><u>Item #4</u> Group consensus indicated the need to revisit the requirements of the meter display.</p> <p><u>Item #5</u> First bullet. Does not need further addressing. The section is intended to meet the requirement of 1612 L.15 Second Bullet: Needs further addressing. The group should review section 1.4 with section 3.4. The group stopped reviewing the APS comments to Citizens concerns at this point. The group decided not to submit the document in its current state to the Utilities Director. Further Discussion and changes need to be made at a future meeting.</p> <p>Action Item: Each utility needs to address the comments by Citizens (similar to what APS did). Each Utility will draft language in areas where appropriate.</p>		
109	New CC&N application needs to be reviewed to verify there are no inconsistencies between what the PSWG has approved. (ACC Staff)					<p>2/21/01 – ACC Staff raised the issue for the group to address</p> <p>Action Item: Ken Grove volunteered to review the MRSP CC&N requirements and report back at the March 7, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>Action Item: Janet Henry volunteered to review the MSP CC&N requirements and report back at the March 7, 2001 meeting.</p> <p>3/7/01 – Jim Wontor reported on suggestion to include items mentioned in the CC&N doc in the approved VEE standards and the performance monitoring doc so the MRSPs have one document that identifies what the expectations are to operate in AZ. The group agreed and passed suggestion to Task Team.</p> <p>Janet will report on MSP CC&N doc at 3/21/01 meeting.</p> <p>3/21/01 Janet Henry (AXON Field Solutions) reported no inconsistencies in the MSP CC&N requirements and suggested the MSP Performance Task Team look at incorporating the require-</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						ments into the Performance document. The group agreed to assign the review of the document regarding certifying workers to classification and how this is going to be accomplished. Janet will highlight the document areas that need to be considered in this review.		
110	What is the process to ensure that all meter data is in before the account goes back to bundled service?					2/21/01 (From Metering Business Rule doc.) How does UDC verify with the ESP that all the data is complete? If data is incomplete how does UDC notify ESP? (data from a previous billing cycle not final bill data). This is being referred to VEE as of 9/27/00 but left here to make sure it is covered and does not need to be part of the Bus Rule Doc.		Open
112	Develop a master list of all acceptable meters within each UDC territory		Policy		09/12/01	3/21/01 Raised by Navopache 09/12/01 The group discussed and resolved the issue by identifying in the metering Handbook (section 3.2) that states "refer to specific UDC". Each ESP will have to go to each Utility to get the approved meter list for that service territory.		Resolved
113	Do the performance standards created for MRSPs and MSPs apply to the UDCs?	04/18/01	MSP			04/18/01 Issue raised by Janet Henry (AXON FS) at MSP meeting 09/12/01 The group discussed the issue and initial thoughts were that performance standards created for MRSPs and MSPs for direct access customer apply to UDCs. After further discussion, it was group consensus that the issue cannot be resolved until there is market participation from the MRSPs/MSPs (do they intend to monitor UDCs? Would they use the same standards?). Additionally a Non-IDR VEE standard needs to be created to complete the picture for performance monitoring. Issue will remain on the issues list until market participation is involved and a Non-IDR VEE standard is created.		Open
114	What are (are there) state the timing requirements for meter testing?	04/18/01	Policy		9/12/01	04/18/01 PSWG Policy 09/12/01 The group discussed the issue and determined there are no state standards. This issue is resolved by answering the question. Any state meter testing and timing requirements will be addressed with issue 107—the metering handbook.		Resolved
115	How will kVAR meters be removed when both kVAR	04/18/01	Policy		09/12/01	04/18/01 PSWG Policy		Resolved

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	and kWh meters are present at a site and an MSP installs a single meter that can read both kVAR and kWh?					09/12/01 The group resolved the issue by stating there will be no state standard. Each utility will have a different practice.		d
116	On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR handbook does not accommodate totalized metered, and metered – unmetered account combinations	05/02/01	Policy			05/02/01 Policy		
117	If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer AFTER the switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected? (PSWG – Billing)	05/02/01	Policy			05/02/01 Policy		
118	ESP Performance Monitoring is as important as MSP/MRSP performance monitoring and would like to see it addressed (Citizens).	06/06/01	Policy					
119	Reading the rules R14-2-1612C, it seems to indicate that the ESP is held to a higher standard since it appears they must report self-slamming. Is this true? (Citizens)	06/06/01	Policy					
120	Which DASR should be used for force close? (Citizens)	06/06/01	Policy			06/06/01 Citizens suggests using the TS DASR. 07/11/01 Stacy Aguayo (APS) indicated the utility must contact the ESP to generate the TS. This is because the customer may give the wrong address or other incorrect information to the UDC. Other-		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>wise the UDC may accidentally terminate a customer.</p> <p>TEP sends a TS DASR. The ESP must make arrangements to pick up their meter.</p> <p>SRP: Calls the ESP to generate the Disconnect (TS) DASR.</p> <p>The group decided this issue, along with another review of the DASR handbook is needed; the suggestion is to form a task team to consider these issues.</p> <p>In the absence of a state standard, each utility may choose their method of conduct, Using the TS DASR is okay until the DASR handbook can be amended.</p> <p>A new issue was uncovered during the discussion: Issue128: Can the UDC accept any "rejected" DASR from an ESP?</p> <p>Pending Task Team</p>		
121	Which DASR should be used for disconnect for non-payment situation? (Citizens)	06/06/01	Policy			<p>06/06/01</p> <p>Citizens suggests using the TS DASR</p> <p>07/11/01</p> <p>TEP sends a TS DASR.</p> <p>APS: did not go that far consider the actual disconnection of service, as most people pay prior to disconnect. Assume at this point that the UDC must still contact the ESP to submit the TS DASR.</p> <p>SRP has ESP consolidated billing, so SRP would never disconnect a customer for non-pay because the ESP is responsible for payment.</p> <p>In the absence of a state standard, each utility may choose their method of conduct, Using the TS DASR is okay until the DASR handbook can be amended.</p> <p>Pending Task Team</p>		
122	Which DASR should be used when the ESP is de-certified. (TEP)	06/06/01	Policy			<p>7/11/01</p> <p>Pending Task Team</p>		
123	Citizens CIS system requires a meter number on accepting the TS DASR, but this DASR doesn't have the meter number as a requirement. What	06/06/01	Policy			<p>06/06/01</p> <p>Suggestion is to add "conditional" to the header, add the meter number as a conditional field to the TS DASR.</p> <p>7/11/01</p> <p>Pending Task Team</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	changes can be made to accommodate this.							
124	The appearance is dissimilar between MRSP and MSP performance monitoring documents. Should these be consolidated into the same book with consistent formatting?	07/11/01	MRSP PM task team			<p>07/11/01 May include a DASR section, VEE section, etc.??</p> <p>09/12/01 The issue was discussed, all utilities believe the documents should be separate. They are two different processes for potentially different entities.</p> <p>Resolve the issue</p>		Resolved
125	Will the decertification process be included in the performance monitoring for MSPs and MRSPs and be standard across all UDCs?	07/11/01	MRSP PM task team			<p>07/11/01 This is regarding decertification in the UDC service territory only.</p>		Open
126	Should the VEE document remain a stand-alone document?	07/11/01	MRSP PM task team			<p>07/11/01 An option is to include it in a statewide DA handbook.</p> <p>09/12/01 TEP recommended, and other utilities other than CUC agreed that the VEE and MRSP Performance monitoring documents be combined as a start of an MRSP Handbook. Issue will remain open to see if Citizens can agree with consensus to combine the documents.</p> <p>Action Item: Citizens Determine if Citizens agrees the documents should be combined as the start of an MRSP handbook.</p>		Open
127	What are the transmission related responsibilities of a UDC in the DA environment, and what ability does it have to set criteria relating to an ESPs energy portfolio?	07/11/01	Policy			<p>07/11/01 Citizens (Ken Bagley/RW Beck) raised the issue. Group is not sure PSWG is the correct forum for this discussion. Ken and Evelyn (TEP) will discuss and determine which entity may be the best group to pose the question to.</p> <p>09/12/01 PSWG is keeping it open to remind participants of issues that may impact PSWG in the future.</p>		Open
128	Can the UDC accept any "rejected" DASR from an	07/11/01	Policy			<p>07/11/01 Uncovered during discussion of issues 120, 121. If UDC</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	ESP?					sends a DASR with an error, can the UDC accept a response (rejected DASR) from the ESP indicating their submittal was bad? Pending Task Team		
129	Consistency in documentation. Docketed EDI 867 in conflict with the director's protocols regarding the time stamp for MRSP.	08/01/01	Policy			08/01/01 Discussion from the group indicated there is a conflict. A document was started months ago that lists all the all changes to the 867 SRP thought someone at SRP was the document owner, and will try to locate it. The director's protocols indicate that EDI data will be in GMT time and that the enveloping will be in sender's local time. The EDI 867 indicates the data will be in Mountain standard time.		
130	Need to create glossary of deregulation terms	8/22/01	Policy			8/22/01 While reviewing Metering handbook, group indicated a need to create a glossary of terms to place in either the Metering Handbook and/or ACC website.		Open
131	Does Citizens need a waiver, or is there a work around for CUC to be in compliance with the 5- Day response to the DASR?	8/22/01	Policy			08/22/01 The specific case is when a DASR is received by CUC for a customer requesting DA at a property where there is currently an active account. <u>Action item:</u> LeeAnn (Citizens/Beck): Find out if CUC's system rejects or accepts the RQ DASR. 09/12/01 LeeAnn Torkelson (Citizens/ RW Beck) reported on the action item if Citizens accepts or rejects the RQ DASR in this case. If the customer has an account number, the RQ DASR (under a manual process) could be accepted After much discussion, the PSWG determined a waiver is not needed if Citizens can respond by rejecting the RQ DASR with appropriate code and comment in the "comments" field. Citizens should expect the ESP to contact Citizens and ask for further explanation and work the DASR in a manual process. Issue remains open pending an answer to the action item. Action Item: Citizens Paul Taylor (RW BECK/Citizens) will determine if Citizens can respond using appropriate codes and comments to reject the DASR.		
132	Identify chapters in the metering handbook that would	8/22/01	Policy		09/12/01	08/22/01 This is to just identify the chapters, not COMPLETE the		Re-solve

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	be easy for the UDCs to address (i.e. Stickers, labels, trouble calls, etc).					chapters! 09/12/01 Clarification: this topic is supposed to identify topics in the metering handbook that requires only UDC input (not MSPs/ESPs/MRSPs input) After discussion it was decided to resolve the issue because the group can start drafts of all open sections.		d